



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/108,232	07/01/1998	GERALD N. COLEMAN	97-674	9068

7590 08/27/2003

KENNETH D'ALESSANDRO
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD
P.O. BOX 6149
STATELINE, NV 89449

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, JERRY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1764

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

34

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/108,232

Applicant(s)

COLEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jerry D. Johnson

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 December 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 51-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 9, 2002 has been entered.

Newly submitted claims 23-50 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: Claims 23-50 are directed to a process whereas the originally filed claims are directed to a composition.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 23-50 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 51-73 and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubin.

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

"[A]s an initial matter, the PTO applies to the verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of

Art Unit: 1764

definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in the applicant's specification." *In re Morris*, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Accordingly "purified water" has been construed by the examiner meaning ordinary water in which some or all impurities have been removed.

Dubin, U.S. Patent 5,284,492, teaches an enhanced lubricity water and fuel oil emulsion (column 3, lines 31-37). The emulsion can be either a water in fuel oil or a fuel oil in water emulsion (column 3, lines 41-44). The oil phase comprises a light fuel oil, by which is meant a fuel oil having little or no aromatic compounds and consists essentially of relatively low molecular weight aliphatic and naphthenic hydrocarbons (column 3, lines 45-49). Such fuels include fuels conventionally known as, *inter alia*, diesel fuel (column 3, lines 61-68). The emulsions advantageously comprise water-in-fuel oil emulsions having up to about 90% water by weight. The emulsions which have the most practical significance in applications when combusted alone are those having about 5% to about 50% water and are preferably about 10% to about 35% water-in-fuel oil by weight (column 4, lines 7-15). Although demineralized water is not required, the use of demineralized water in the emulsion is preferred (column 4, lines 30-35). The emulsions are prepared such that the discontinuous phase preferably has a particle size wherein at least about 70% of the droplets are below about 5 microns Sauter mean diameter. More preferably, at least about 85%, and most preferably at least about 90% of the droplets are below about 5 microns Sauter mean diameter (column 4, lines 38-44). An emulsification system is most preferably employed to maintain the emulsion. A desirable emulsification system comprises about 35% to about 85% by weight of an amide, especially an alkanolamide or n-substituted alkyl amine; about 5% to about 25% by weight of a phenolic surfactant; and about

Art Unit: 1764

0% to about 40% by weight of a difunctional block polymer terminating in a primary hydroxyl group (column 5, lines 2+). The addition of a component selected from the group consisting of dimmer and/or trimer acids, sulfurized castor oil, phosphate esters, and mixtures thereof significantly increase the lubricity of the emulsion (column 7, lines 15+). The addition of a corrosion inhibitor is taught in column 8, lines 56 to column 9, line 2.

While Dubin differs from the instant claims in not disclosing the claimed method of forming the emulsion, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production, *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ at 966.

Claims 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubin as applied to claims 1-73 and 76-78 above, and further in view of Hazbun et al.

Hazbun et al., U.S. Patent 4,770,670, is relied on as teaching that is well known in the art that emulsion stability is pH dependent and that pH can be adjusted by adding excess acid or base (column 12, lines 18-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to adjust the pH of an emulsion as taught by Dubin in order to increase the stability of said emulsion wherein said pH is adjusted by adding excess acid or base as taught by Hazbun et al.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 71 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1764

Claim 71 improperly recites “said flow of additives is comprised of a flow said antifreeze. . . .”

Claim 78 lacks a period at the end of the claim.

Applicant's arguments filed December 9, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue

Dubin teaches that the emulsions are prepared such that the discontinuous phase preferably has a particle size wherein at least about 70% of the droplets are below about 5 microns Sauter mean diameter. More preferably, at least about 85%, and most preferably at least about 90%, of the droplets are below about 5 microns Sauter mean diameter for emulsion stability. (Col. 4, lines 38-44) In contrast, the present application teaches an emulsion having average droplet size of less than about 5 microns, with an average droplet size of about 1 micron or less preferred, and with an average droplet size of about 0.1 microns to about 1 micron most preferred. (Remarks, page 17).

Applicants' argument lacks merit.

A droplet size of “below about 5 microns” as taught by Dubin includes the instantly claimed droplet size. Furthermore, Dubin teaches that “[e]mulsion stability is largely related to droplet size.” (Column 4, line 45). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to adjust the droplet size to give the most stable and economical emulsion.

Applicants argue “[p]urified water is not demineralized water.” (Remarks, page 16).

Applicants' argument lacks merit.

Art Unit: 1764


As noted above, the term "purified water" includes demineralized water. Furthermore, Dubin teaches that "[a]lthough demineralized water is not required . . . the use of demineralized water in the emulsion . . . is preferred in order to avoid the deposit of minerals from the water on the blades and other internal surfaces of the gas turbine." (Column 4, lines 30-35).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use water in which some, but not all, of the mineral content has been removed in order to reduce the amount of mineral deposits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry D. Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2515. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30, M-F, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Caldarola can be reached on (703) 308-6824. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Jerry D. Johnson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1764

JDJ